

Pocahontas's Two Rescues and Her Fluid Loyalty

Hiroyuki Tsukada

ポカホンタスの二つの助命と忠誠心の揺らぎ

塚田 浩幸

要 旨

ポカホンタスは、二度、ジョン・スミスの命を救った。一度目は有名な助命で、1607年12月、インディアンの首長パウハタンによる処刑の寸前に、ポカホンタスが捕虜スミスに自分の体をなげうって助命をした。これは、スミスの死と生まれ変わりを象徴的に意味し、入植者をインディアンの世界に迎え入れる儀式で、ポカホンタスはスミスを救うというあらかじめ決められた役割を担った。この一度目の助命の真偽については長らく論争が行なわれてきたが、スミスが1608年6月の報告書簡でポカホンタスを「比類なき人物」と高く評価できたという事実は、助命が実際に起きたことを示している。その6月の時点で、スミスは助命の他に、取引や物資の提供と人質解放交渉の場面でポカホンタスと会う機会を持っていたが、それらの場面においては、スミスが「比類なき人物」と評価することができるほどの行動をポカホンタスがとっていなかったからである。そして、スミスがその報告書簡でポカホンタスを紹介したのは、入植事業の宣伝のためにインディアンとの平和友好をアピールするねらいがあった。つまり、スミスに批判的な研究者が主張するように、スミスがポカホンタスの人気にあやかって自分の名声をあげるために助命を捏造したのではなく、助命に感銘を受けたスミスがポカホンタスの人気を作り上げたといえるのである。

パウハタンは、一度目の助命でポカホンタスをインディアンと入植者の平和友好のシンボルとして仕立て上げ、その後の平和的な外交の場面にもポカホンタスを同行させていた。しかしながら、二度目の助命は、パウハタンの外交方針に逆らって、ポカホンタス自身の意思によって行なわれた。1609年1月、インディアンと入植者の関係が悪化するなか、パウハタンがスミスを本当に襲おうとしているところをポカホンタスがスミスに密告して救った。この二つの助命のあいだの期間、ポカホンタスは入植者と頻繁に会うなかで理解を深め、パウハタン連合のインディアンとしての忠誠心に揺らぎを生じさせていたのである。つまり、ポカホンタスは、単なるパウハタンの遣いとしての平和友好のシンボルであることをやめ、自らを平和友好の使者として確立させるに至ったのである。



Table of contents

1. Introduction
2. A special relationship between Pocahontas and John Smith
3. Refutation of all existing theories
4. Demonstration of the veracity of the rescue
5. Conclusion

1. Introduction

Pocahontas saved John Smith twice. The first instance came in December 1607, when she symbolically offered her own head to save Smith's during a diplomatic ritual (of which Smith was unaware) conducted by her father, Powhatan. As Juliana Bar said, in contrast to war parties of Indian men, Indian women often served as peaceful symbols in diplomacy. Pocahontas began to play that role in the first ritual rescue and continued playing that role in various diplomatic situations. She rescued John Smith for the second time in January 1609, this time of her own will and against Powhatan's diplomatic policy. The comparison of the two rescues elucidates her "fluid loyalty" that go-betweens understand other people and can disregard their own people's interest, but it is valid only after the dispute over the veracity of the first rescue, which has been unsolved in the past 150 years, is concluded.¹

The main initiator of the dispute, Henry Adams, commanded in his 1867 article, "every historian should hereafter take one side or the other in regard to this serious question."² Since then, many historians, anthropologists, and other critics have taken one or the other position or, at least, commented on it. They currently agree that, contrary to many fictional depictions that were initiated by Marquis de Chastellux and John Davis in the late eighteenth century and the early nineteenth century, Pocahontas did not save Smith because she loved him or because of her sense of humanity, but they continue to argue whether the rescue was performed as an Indian ritual.³

When Adams wrote his article in 1867, he had, at least in part, a political reason to attack Smith's writings. Although Adams believed, after his first research experience at the British Museum, that the rescue might have occurred, he ultimately decided to attack Smith because it would be "in some sort a flank, or rather a rear attack, on the Virginia aristocracy." Adams's motivation was sustained by another New England historian, John Gorham Palfrey, who convinced him that he would attract much attention as a fledgling historian by doing so. Even if the beginnings of the dispute over the veracity of the rescue were instigated disingenuously by Adams's academic motives, later researchers have not been able to settle the dispute.⁴

The Northern historians compared primary sources with each other and pointed out inconsistency between them. A description of the event was in Smith's *The Generall Historie of Virginia, New-England, and the Summer Isles* in 1624, but not in Smith's *A True Relation* in 1608 or in other contemporaries' writings, except Samuel Purchas's of 1625, which referred to Smith's *Generall Historie*. Smith's critics concluded that he fabricated the story in 1624 to set himself up as a hero, and Smith's honor was almost entirely disgraced by the critics, such as Edward Neill, who stated in 1869 that Smith's writings were "those of a gascon and beggar." Moreover, in 1890, Hungarian historian Lewis L. Kropf challenged the accuracy of Smith's writings on southeastern Europe, where he was before he went to Virginia. The tide of opinion did not

turn on behalf of Smith's defense until the second half of the twentieth century, and then it occurred mostly because of the efforts of Bradford Smith, Laura Polanyi Striker, and Philip L. Barbour, who reassessed the accuracy of Smith's writings, although certainly admitting to Smith's embellishment.⁵

Since the 1960s, interdisciplinary studies in history and anthropology have analyzed American history from a Native American perspective. In 1971, Robert F. Berkhofer, Jr. proposed the "New Indian history," in which indigenous peoples should be central to historical writings.⁶ In this academic trend, Pocahontas's rescue was analyzed from the perspective of the Powhatan Indians. Frederic Gleach and Helen C. Rountree, two of the most focused anthropologists studying the Virginia Indians, argued with each other about the rescue. Gleach earnestly insisted that the rescue was a Powhatan ritual, whereas Rountree doubted that a girl would have been allowed to participate in such a ritual. Rountree even insisted that, during her lifetime, Pocahontas was not considered particularly extraordinary by the Powhatan Indians or the English, which undermined her status.⁷

Smith's supporters have proposed five theories to insist that the rescue occurred. First, they have argued that John Healey, the editor of *True Relation* in 1608, erased the rescue from Smith's June 1608 letter while publishing it. Second, other Smith supporters have insisted that Smith originally hid the rescue in the letter. The third theory is that Smith's contemporaries did not doubt his writings about the rescue. The fourth theory is the Indian ritual theory proposing that Smith did not understand Pocahontas's predetermined role in the Indian ritual to save his life. The last theory is the special relationship theory, which posits that Pocahontas and Smith cultivated a mutual understanding after the rescue.

Although none of these theories has conclusively demonstrated that the rescue happened, the strongest is the special relationship theory, and its indispensable primary source of support is Smith's *True Relation*. In that publication, Smith admired Pocahontas as "not only for feature, countenance, and proportion, much exceedeth any of the rest of his [Powhatan's] people, but for wit, and spirit, the only Nonpareil [Nonpareil] of his Country." To demonstrate that the rescue occurred, all of the meetings between Pocahontas and Smith until June 1608 and the factors that determined Smith's evaluation of Pocahontas as "Nonpareil" should be analyzed and elucidated.⁸

2. A special relationship between Pocahontas and John Smith

Pocahontas was born around 1596. Her father was Powhatan, and her mother is unknown. Powhatan became the paramount chief of the Powhatan paramount chiefdom during the second half of the sixteenth century, which, at that time, comprised six chiefdoms near the fall line of the James and York rivers. By 1607, through his military successes, the paramount chiefdom had increased to about 30 chiefdoms ruling a population of about 14,000 people. Each Powhatan chiefdom paid tribute to Powhatan, who, in return, provided protection. Bordering the Powhatan paramount chiefdom were the Piscataway Indians to the north and the Monacan Indians to the west, and the latter was particularly antagonistic toward Powhatan.⁹

Powhatan had observed the English for several months after they began building their Virginia colony in May 1607, and, during that period, some colonists visited some of the Powhatan chiefdoms along the James River and enjoyed trade and entertainment. The Indians were surprised by the destructive power of the Europeans' weapons, but they also noted English weaknesses. For example, the colonists' food supplies depended on the Indians and about one half of the colonists died from drinking the dirty James River water.¹⁰

In December 1607, Powhatan set his first policy toward the English colonists, which incorporated them into his paramount chiefdom. He did not consider the colonists a serious threat because their population was much smaller than that of the Powhatan Indians and they did not have sufficient knowledge or skill to survive in Virginia. Powhatan aimed to strengthen his authority within and outside his paramount chiefdom by obtaining the English resources. The Powhatan Indians took Smith captive and performed multiple rituals including Pocahontas's rescue.

Gleach discussed these Indian rituals and the process of English incorporation in detail. In *True Relation*, Smith explained about one of the rituals he experienced before he met Powhatan that, with rattling and singing, the Indians put "a Circle of meale" to environ the fire, "layde downe two or three graines of wheate" outside the meal, and then placed "a little sticke" at the next outer space. In this ritual, "meale" represented the Powhatan world, "graines" meant the boundaries of the Powhatan world, and "stick" indicated the English of the outside world. In other words, in this ritual, the Indians identified the colonists as outsiders, but not as strangers, in their world. After some other rituals were performed, including Pocahontas's rescue, Smith and the other colonists were finally considered insiders. In the last ritual in "a great house in the woods" at Werowocomoco, the capital of the Powhatan paramount chiefdom, Powhatan pronounced that "he would give him the Country of Capahowosick, and for ever esteeme him as his sonne Nantaquoud."¹¹

After Smith was freed in early January 1608, Powhatan wanted to meet Christopher Newport, another English leader. At a conference in February 1608, Powhatan clearly reiterated the incorporation. According to Smith, Powhatan "proclaimed me [Smith] a werowanes of Powhatan, and that all his subjects should so esteeme us, and no man account us strangers nor Paspahaghans, but Powhatans, and that the Corne, weomen and Country, should be to us as to his owne people." In other words, Powhatan considered Smith one of the chiefs of the Powhatan paramount chiefdom and the English colonists as equal in status to the Powhatan Indians. Moreover, Powhatan wanted to play a leading role in trade and demanded that Newport should lay down all his belongings, for which Powhatan would give him things in return that he assessed as being equal in value. Some of Powhatan's other behaviors after the release of Smith also suggest this incorporation. For example, every few days, he sent Pocahontas and other Indians to Jamestown to deliver provisions, and during the following spring the Powhatan Indians taught the colonists their agricultural methods and how to make fishing tools.¹²

For a while, Newport engaged in trade with the Indians as taught by Powhatan, but Smith was dissatisfied with the biased trade balance and, as soon as Newport left for England in April 1608, put an end to the imbalance in trading. In response, Powhatan ordered his Indians to steal the colonists' goods in compensation for lack of return, and the English detained the Indian thieves. In about May 1608, Powhatan sent envoys, including Pocahontas, to ask Smith to free his people. At that time, Pocahontas was a symbol of peace and Smith freed the Indian captives. The reconciliation was temporary, however, because Powhatan, who wanted to monopolize trade with the colonists, became unpleasant regarding the English exploration of the northern Chesapeake area in June through September 1608 and their visit to the Monacan Indians in about October of that year.¹³

In September 1608, Newport returned to Jamestown with a crown from King James to present to Powhatan. Smith and his company went to Werowocomoco, but Powhatan was absent. While they waited for Powhatan's arrival, Pocahontas and other Indian women entertained them by singing, dancing, and so on, which still presented a peaceful attitude on behalf of the Powhatan Indians toward the colonists. After that, the colonists invited Powhatan to Jamestown, but he replied, "If your king have sent me presents, I also am a king, and this my land, 8 daies I will stay to receave them." Powhatan also stubbornly resisted kneeling at the coronation ceremony, although he finally stooped down to receive the crown. The

English intended to use this coronation to define Powhatan's status under the King of England, which was a clear contrast to Powhatan's rituals in December 1607 to incorporate the colony.¹⁴

In response to these defiant acts, Powhatan ordered his people to withhold provisions from the colonists, and Smith had no option but to threaten the Indians. In late 1608, Powhatan invited Smith to a meeting, which was held in January 1609. En route to Werowocomoco, a Warraskoyack Indian cautioned Smith, "Captaine Smith, you shall finde Powhatan to use you kindly, but trust him not, and bee sure hee hath no opportunitie to seaze on your armes, for hee hath sent for you only to cut your throats." Powhatan and Smith complained about each other at their meeting, and Smith finally told Powhatan, "you must knowe as I have but one God, I honour but one king; and I live not here as your subject, but as your friend." Powhatan did not tolerate this statement because he considered the colonists his subjects. Powhatan proceeded to plot to attack Smith and his company, but Pocahontas's real rescue occurred. The event was briefly mentioned in *The Proceedings of the English Colonie in Virginia* in 1612 and more fully described in Smith's *Generall Historie* in 1624. Pocahontas came through the woods in the dark of the night "with the teares running downe her cheeks" and warned Smith of Powhatan's plot. Soon after that, "if Powhatan should know it, she were but dead, and so shee ranne away by her self as she came."¹⁵

Pocahontas had maintained regular contact with Smith and other colonists since December 1607. She had cultivated mutual understandings with and held some sympathy toward them, and her real rescue of Smith was not her only one. She saved at least one other Englishman, Richard Wyffin. While Smith was meeting with Powhatan in January 1609, some colonists in Jamestown had drowned in the James River. Wyffin traveled to Werowocomoco to report the incident to Smith, but he arrived there after Smith's departure. Powhatan intended to kill Wyffin, but "Pocahontas hid him [Wyffin] for a time, and sent them [Powhatan Indians] who pursued him the cleane contrary way to seeke him." Thanks to her help, Wyffin was able to return to Jamestown.¹⁶

As the relationship between the Powhatan Indians and the English deteriorated, Pocahontas gradually receded from the colonists. Starting in late summer 1609, the English attempted to build new settlements along the James River, and the Indians' military resistance against those efforts provoked the First Anglo-Powhatan War. When Samuel Argall abducted Pocahontas in 1613, the colonists had not seen her for more than three years. In April 1614, Pocahontas converted to Christianity and married John Rolfe, which ended the war. Thomas Dale and Alexander Whitaker celebrated the peace and referred to her marriage in their letters.¹⁷

In 1616-17, Pocahontas visited England and reunited with Smith, who had left Virginia in autumn 1609. In her statement, which Smith recorded in *Generall Historie* in 1624, Pocahontas hoped to confirm their friendships, reminding him of the fictive kinship that had been constructed in December 1607. Moreover, she asserted herself as the only Indian with some mutual understandings with the English, saying that the English were "not afraid to come into my fathers Countrie, and caused feare in him and all his people (but mee)." Thus, Pocahontas willingly worked as a mediator of peace between the Powhatan Indians and the English.¹⁸

In their conversation, Smith refused to be referred to as "father" because of her nobleness as Powhatan's daughter, which did not satisfy her. It is certain, however, that Smith also continued to hold special feelings for her. In his dedication to Frances Howard, Duchesse of Richmond and Lenox, his only benefactor for publishing *Generall Historie* in 1624, Smith referred to Pocahontas as one of the few women to whom he felt indebted during his life, stating "In the utmost of many extremities, that blessed Pokahontas, the great Kings daughter of Virginia, oft saved my life." In that book, he increased his references to Pocahontas, including two kinds of her rescues of him. Smith later defined the meanings of history as "the

memory of time, the life of the dead, and the happiness of the living,” and, in his 1624 historical book, he wrote down his memory of the time he had spent with Pocahontas.¹⁹

3. Refutation of all existing theories

The first mention of Pocahontas’s December 1607 rescue was not in Smith’s *Generall Historie* in 1624 because Smith had briefly mentioned it in *New Englands Trials* in 1622, where he stated: “It is true in our greatest extremitie they shot me, slue three of my men, and by the folly of them that fled tooke me prisoner; yet God made Pocahontas the Kings daughter the meanes to deliver me.” Moreover, Smith wrote in his petition to Queen Ann to grant special treatment to Pocahontas during her visit to England in 1616 “at the minute of my execution, she hazarded the beating out of her owne braines to save mine” and that her noble act “gave me much cause to respect her” (although his petition is extant only as an insertion in *Generall Historie* in 1624). The rescue was not mentioned in *True Relation* in 1608 or in any contemporaries’ writings, except for Purchas’s of 1625. Smith’s critics have noted on this inconsistency to denigrate his authenticity, but his supporters have presented five theories, although not entirely successfully.²⁰

As for the inconsistency across Smith’s writings, particularly between *True Relation* in 1608 and *Generall Historie* in 1624, Barbour insisted that Healey, *True Relation*’s editor in 1608, omitted Smith’s mention of the rescue. Barbour reasoned that Smith’s introduction of Pocahontas in *True Relation* was too casual, and a more detailed description might be erased. Healey certainly admitted that he had omitted some parts that he considered “private,” but whether the rescue was a part of that omission is not known.²¹

Some of Smith’s defenders have insisted that Smith initially might not have written about the rescue in his June 1608 letter because he hoped to maintain his personal prestige and to gain enough financial support from the English speculators for the colonial venture. He wanted to convince the English of his ability to control the Indians and being rescued by an Indian girl suggested weakness. Moreover, by hiding Powhatan’s hostility, Smith aimed to convey the notion that the colonists kept a good relationship with the Indians and the colonial enterprise was running well. Further, the rescue no longer embarrassed Smith or worried the English in 1624, by which time Pocahontas’s fame had been established.²² This explanation of Smith’s perspective is plausible, but it is not conclusive enough to demonstrate the veracity of the rescue because it is equally possible that Smith fabricated the rescue as a way to gain prestige for his 1624 writings.

J. A. Leo Lemay earnestly insisted that Smith’s contemporaries did not doubt the veracity of the rescue. George Percy was critical of Smith, but did not refute him about the rescue, and Purchas, who gathered information on the colony from English returnees and Indian visitors in England, followed Smith’s 1624 description of the rescue in 1625. According to Smith, who was the only English person present during the rescue, more than 200 Indians witnessed it, and it is probable that many Indians not present during the rescue, such as Opechancanough, another Indian leader, who took Smith captive and delivered him to Powhatan in December 1607, knew about it.²³ It is, however, uncertain whether any English except for Smith obtained accurate information about the rescue from the Powhatan Indians. Therefore, Smith’s contemporaries’ silence and Purchas’s mention do not necessarily mean that the rescue occurred.

Most scholars have accepted the theory that, although Smith was unaware of the fact, the rescue was the Indian adoption ritual symbolizing Smith’s death as an Englishman and rebirth as a Powhatan. That theory has been put forth since the nineteenth century, and its current most eager advocate is anthropologist Gleach, who elaborately demonstrated

the transformation of the relationship between the Powhatan paramount chiefdom and the Virginia colony through Smith's captivity period. In England in 1616-17, Pocahontas reminded Smith that Powhatan and Smith had developed a fictive kinship, which corroborates this theory.²⁴ This theory, however, does not conclusively demonstrate the veracity of the rescue because other rituals could have functioned enough to incorporate the colony into the paramount chiefdom and to build a fictive kinship. In other words, this theory only claims that the rescue would have been the Indian ritual if it had happened.

Rountree's opposition to the Indian ritual theory is also refutable. Rountree insisted that an Indian girl, such as Pocahontas, would not have participated in such rituals. On Pocahontas's age, Smith inconsistently stated that she was "a child of tenne yeares old" in *True Relation* in 1608 and "a childe of twelve or thirteene yeeres of age" in his letter to Queen Ann in 1616. *Proceedings* in 1612 stated "at most not past 13 or 14 yeares of age" (as of 1609). Moreover, William Strachey explained about Indian female clothing that "their younger women goe not shadowed [naked] amongst their owne company ... but being past once 12. yeres they put on a kynd of semicinctum leathren apron," and he referred to Pocahontas in 1608 as an example of the former. Furthermore, "Aetatis suae 21 Anno" (20 years old) is indicated on her only portrait, which was painted by Simon van de Passe in England in 1616-17. These primary sources recorded Pocahontas's age as ten to thirteen years old in December 1607, likely meaning that she was a child. It cannot be denied, however, that Pocahontas was an extraordinary girl because, although Powhatan had ten more daughters, Pocahontas was his only daughter to often visit the colony under Powhatan's orders.²⁵

On the special relationship between Pocahontas and Smith, some researchers have often focused on the negotiations to free the Indian hostages in about May 1608 with attention to Smith's account of the negotiations. William Wirt Henry proposed that Powhatan would not have risked his dearest daughter as an envoy if a mutual understanding between Smith and Pocahontas had not already been established during the December 1607 rescue. This perspective certainly seems plausible, although it is speculative. Camilla Townsend noted Smith's introduction of Pocahontas as "Nonpariel" in his paragraph about the negotiations in *True Relation* and insisted that Smith would not have given such a high evaluation of her "without previous acquaintance." This observation is noteworthy, but Townsend did not identify the rescue as the only ground of Smith's high evaluation.²⁶ Therefore, none of the theories and Rountree's opposition has conclusively demonstrated the veracity of the rescue.

4. Demonstration of the veracity of the rescue

Townsend's notice should be further investigated by analyzing all of the meetings between Smith and Pocahontas up to June 1608. By that point, they had experienced contact with each other in three ways: the rescue in December 1607, which was the first contact between them, the Indians' provision and trade activities from January through June 1608, and the negotiations to free the Indian hostages in about May 1608. Regarding the provisions offered and traded, Powhatan sent Pocahontas and other Indians to the colonists after the adoption rituals regarding Smith and until about October 1608 at the latest, when he ordered the Powhatan Indians to stop trading food because of various English behaviors that defied him, such as their visits to the outside Indians and the coronation ceremony. Among the colonists, Smith played a leading part in the provision and trade activities until June 1608, when, after dispatching the letter, he went to the northern Chesapeake area to explore.²⁷

Smith's contemporaries' sources indicate that Pocahontas and Smith had many opportunities to cultivate an amicable

relationship in the offer and exchange of provisions. Strachey explained that Pocahontas “sometymes resort[ed] to our Fort” and played with other children in “the markt place.” Smith’s introduction of the Powhatan vocabulary in *A Map of Virginia* in 1612 includes the following example: “*Kekaten Pokahontas patiaquagh ningh tanks manotyens neer mowchick rawrenock audowgh*. Bid Pokahontas bring hither two little Baskets, and I will give her white beads to make her a chaine.” Further, Smith wrote in 1624, “once in foure or five dayes, Pocahontas with her attendants, brought him [Smith] so much provision” and in his petition to Queen Ann in 1616, “this relief [provisions] ... was commonly brought us by this Lady Pocahontas.” Although these writings state that Pocahontas joined in the offer and exchange in provisions as well as played with other children, it is doubtful that she played a part in any activities significant enough to warrant the characterization of “Nonpariel.” That her role was minor is corroborated by the fact that Smith did not refer in *True Relation* in 1608 to her role in the offer and exchange of provisions despite using the “Nonpariel” term of high regard.²⁸

The negotiations to free the Indian hostages in about May 1608 were described in *True Relation* in 1608 and repeatedly mentioned in *Proceedings* in 1612 and in *Generall Historie* in 1624, but none of these writings states that Pocahontas played a significant role in the negotiations. In fact, the reasons Smith freed the Indian hostages were Powhatan’s “kindnesse” in sending Pocahontas and the persuasiveness of Powhatan’s “most trustie messenger,” namely, Rawhunt, who had “a subtill wit and crafty understanding.” Pocahontas was merely a symbol of peace in the negotiations, and an assessment of her as “Nonpariel” was not developed at that time.²⁹

As a leader of the Virginia colonization project, Smith seemed to have two main points in mind when he wrote the June 1608 letter. First, he did not want to degrade himself and, second, he aimed to point out the bright prospects of the colonial venture. Writing about Pocahontas’s rescue might have undermined his reputation, but he needed to advertise her as a symbol of peace. Information about the negotiations to free the Indian hostages was in the last part of *True Relation*, which covered the time from the English voyage and landing in Virginia in April 1607 through to June 1608. The discord that developed between the Indians and the colonists in April to May 1608 was stated as having been softened by Pocahontas and the epilogue of *True Relation* indicated the hopeful expectation for “a continuall peace with the Indians.” Therefore, in 1608 *True Relation*, Smith presented Pocahontas as a heroine without mentioning the rescue. After that, Pocahontas gained fame among the English with the label “Nonpariel.” *Proceedings* in 1612 also used the word to introduce her and Ralph Hamor wrote in 1615 that her “fame hath even bin spred in England by the title of Nonparells of Virginia.” Strachey scattered some mention of her in his writings, although he never met her, suggesting that the English were quite interested in Pocahontas.³⁰

Based on this analysis, the fact that Smith could evaluate Pocahontas as “Nonpariel” in *True Relation* in 1608 validates that the rescue occurred. By June 1608, when he dispatched the letter, Smith and Pocahontas had met during the rescue, through the offer and exchange of provisions, and in the negotiations to free the Indian hostages. In these situations (other than the rescue itself,) Pocahontas did not have a significant enough role to justify being labeled “Nonpariel,” and she merely functioned as a symbol of peace. Smith believed that Pocahontas had truly saved his life, and began to “respect” her as “Nonpariel.”³¹ From the Indian perspective, however, the rescue was an Indian adoption ritual, through which Powhatan aimed to incorporate the colony into his paramount chiefdom, as Gleach explained. In that ritual, Pocahontas played a mediating part in saving Smith’s life just before execution. In other words, in the ritual rescue, Powhatan used Pocahontas as a mediator of peace between the Powhatan Indians and the English colonists. Then, Powhatan sent her as a symbol of peace to the colony for the offer and exchange of provisions and the negotiations to free the Indian hostages. Pocahontas did not literally save Smith’s life in December 1607, but the Indian ritual that parodied such a rescue was performed.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, the Indian ritual of a rescue is a historical fact, and Smith's misunderstandings and special feelings for Pocahontas certainly motivated his writings on it. Since he truly believed that she had saved his life, he introduced her admirable personality in 1608 and wrote the impressive episode in 1624. Smith's critics have wrongly argued that he fabricated Pocahontas's first rescue to enhance his reputation in 1624. In reality, he produced her to advance the English colonial project in June 1608.

The ritual rescue in December 1607 established Pocahontas as a symbol of peace to both sides of the conflict. On the one side, Powhatan established her as a mediator, and, on the other side, Smith admired her actions during the rescue and labeled her a heroine in 1608 *True Relation*. Despite that, Pocahontas was neither a mere symbol nor a tool because, about one year later, in January 1609, she actually rescued Smith from Powhatan's raiding plot. By that time, Pocahontas had developed special relationships with the English, particularly with Smith, and she established herself as a mediator of peace between the two different peoples coexisting during the uneasy days of early colonial Virginia.

(Table 1) Smith's supporters (O) and critics (X)

	Editor's omission / Smith's concealment	Contemporaries' approval	Indian ritual	Special relationship
C. Deane (1860)	X			
H. Adams (1867)	X			
E. Neill (1869)	X			
W. W. Henry (1875)	O	O		O
F. Jameson (1891)	X			
C. Poindexter (1893)	O			
J. Fiske (1897)	O	O	O	
A. Brown (1898)	X			
B. Smith (1953)	O			
P. Barbour (1971/1986)	O		O	
F. Mossiker (1976)	O	O	O	
P. Hulme (1986)			O	
L. Lemay (1992)	O	O	O	O
M. H. Williamson (1992)			O	
F. Gleach (1997)			O	
K. Brown (1999)	O		O	O
D. Richter (2001)			O	
H. Rountree (2001/2005)	X		X	

[Sources: Henry Adams, "Captain John Smith," *North American Review* 104 (1867): 1-30; Philip L. Barbour, *Pocahontas and Her World* (London: Robert Hale, 1971), 24-25; idem, editorial note to John Smith, *A True Relation*, ed. John Healey (1608), in *The Complete Works of Captain John Smith (1580-1631)* (3 vols.; Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986), 1: 108; Alexander Brown, *The First Republic in America* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and company, 1898); Kathleen Brown, "In Search of Pocahontas," in *The Human Tradition in Colonial America*, eds. Ian K. Steele and Nancy L. Rhoden (Wilmington: SR Books, 1999), 73-83; Charles Deane, editorial note to Edward Maria Wingfield, "A Discourse of Virginia" (1608), *Archaeologica Americana: Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society* 4 (1860): 67-103,

esp. 92-95; John Fiske, *Old Virginia and Her Neighbours* (2 vols.; Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1897), 1: 105-11; Frederic W. Gleach, *Powhatan's World and Colonial Virginia: A Conflict of Cultures* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), 109-22; William Wirt Henry, "The Rescue of Captain John Smith by Pocahontas," *Potter's American Monthly* 4 (1875): 523-28, 591-97; Peter Hulme, *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean, 1492-1797* (London: Methuen, 1986), chaps. 4; J. Franklin Jameson, *The History of Historical Writing in America* (Boston: Houghton, 1891), 4-13; J. A. Leo Lemay, *Did Pocahontas Save Captain John Smith?* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1992); Frances Mossiker, *Pocahontas: The Life and the Legend* (New York: Knopf, 1976), 81-86; Edward D. Neill, *History of the Virginia Company of London* (Albany: Joel Munsell, 1869), 211; Charles Poindexter, *Captain John Smith and His Critics* (Richmond: J. L. Hill, 1893), 28-63; Daniel K. Richter, *Facing East from the Indian Country: A Native History of Early America* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001), 69-78; Helen C. Rountree, "Pocahontas: The Hostage Who Became Famous," in *Sifters: Native American Women's Lives*, ed. Theda Perdue (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 14; idem, *Pocahontas, Powhatan, Opechancanough: Three Indian Lives Changed by Jamestown* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2005), 76-82; Bradford Smith, *Captain John Smith: His Life and Legend* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1953), 116; Margaret Holmes Williamson, "Pocahontas and Captain John Smith," *History and Anthropology* 5 (1992): 365-402.]

(Table 2) Chronological table of Pocahontas

-Around 1596:	Birth
-December 1607:	First ritual rescue of John Smith
-January through around October 1608:	Participated in the provision and trade activities
-Around May 1608: (-June 1608:)	Dispatched in the negotiations for the liberation of the Indian hostages (Smith sent a report, which would be edited and published as <i>True Relation</i> .)
-September 1608:	Gave entertainment to Smith and his companies
-January 1609:	Second rescue of Smith and another rescue of Richard Wyffin
-Around November 1609:	Rescue of Henry Spelman
-1613:	Kidnapped by Samuel Argall
-April 1614:	Conversion to Christianity and marriage with John Rolfe
-1614-15:	Birth of Thomas Rolfe
-1616-17:	Visit to England, reunification with Smith, and death

Note

- 1 This article uses the word “rescue” even for the parodied version. Juliana Barr, *Peace Came in the Form of a Woman: Indians and Spaniards in the Texas Borderlands* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007); Kathleen Brown, “In Search of Pocahontas,” in *The Human Tradition in Colonial America*, eds. Ian K. Steele and Nancy L. Rhoden (Wilmington: SR Books, 1999), 71-96; Karen Ordahl Kupperman, *Pocahontas and the English Boys: Caught between Cultures in Early Virginia* (New York: New York University Press, 2019). “Fluid loyalty” is owed to Kupperman’s most recent works, but she did not pay much attention to Pocahontas’s one in 1607-09. On “go-betweeners” who stepped in and downplayed differences of two cultures, see James H. Merrell, *Into the American Woods: Negotiators on the Pennsylvania Frontier* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1999).
- 2 Henry Adams, “Captain John Smith,” *North American Review* 104 (1867): 14.
- 3 Marquis de Chastellux, *Travels in North-America, in the Years 1780, 1781, and 1782*, trans. Howard C. Rice, Jr. (1786; 2 vols.; Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1963); John Davis, *Travels of Four Years and a Half in the United States of America during 1798, 1799, 1800, 1801, and 1802*, ed. A. J. Morrison (1803; New York: Holt, 1909); Robert S. Tilton, *Pocahontas: The Evolution of an American Narrative* (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- 4 Henry Adams to John Gorham Palfrey, 23 Oct. 1861 and 20 Mar. 1862, in *The Letters of Henry Adams*, eds. J. C. Levenson, et al. (6 vols.; Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1982-88), 1: 258, 287; idem, *The Education of Henry Adams* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1918), 222.
- 5 Edward D. Neill, *History of the Virginia Company of London* (Albany: Joel Munsell, 1869), 211; Kevin J. Hayes, *Captain John Smith: A Reference Guide* (Boston: G. K. Hall, 1991), xiv-xxiii; Madoka Sato, “A Re-Examination of Disputes on Captain John Smith’s Rescue by Pocahontas,” *Journal of Historical Studies* (Rikkyo University), 76.1 (2015): 81-94 (in Japanese).
- 6 James Axtell, *The European and the Indian: Essays in the Ethnohistory of Colonial North America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), 3-15; Robert F. Berkhofer, Jr., “The Political Context of a New Indian History,” *Pacific Historical Review* 40.3 (1971): 357-82; Francis Jennings, “A Growing Partnership: Historians, Anthropologists and American Indian History,” *Ethnohistory* 29.1 (1982): 21-34; Wilcomb E. Washburn, “Ethnohistory: History ‘In the Round,’” *Ethnohistory* 8.1 (1961): 31-48.
- 7 Frederic W. Gleach, *Powhatan’s World and Colonial Virginia: A Conflict of Cultures* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), 109-22; Helen C. Rountree, “Pocahontas: The Hostage Who Became Famous,” in *Sifters: Native American Women’s Lives*, ed. Theda Perdue (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 14; idem, *Pocahontas, Powhatan, Opechancanough: Three Indian Lives Changed by Jamestown* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2005), 76-82.
- 8 John Smith, *A True Relation*, ed. John Healey (1608), in *The Complete Works of Captain John Smith (1580-1631)*, ed. Philip L. Barbour (3 vols.; Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986), 1: 93.
- 9 Seth Mallios, *The Deadly Politics of Giving: Exchange and Violence at Ajacan, Roanoke, and Jamestown* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2006), 9-15; Helen C. Rountree, *The Powhatan Indians of Virginia: Their Traditional Culture* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1989); idem, ed., *Powhatan Foreign Relations, 1500-1722* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1993).
- 10 Smith, *True Relation*, 33-43; Gabriel Archer, *A Relation of the Discovery of Our River*, and George Percy, “Observations Gathered Out of a Discourse of the Plantation of the Southern Colonie in Virginia,” in *Writings with Other Narratives of Roanoke, Jamestown, and the First English Settlement of America*, ed. James Horn (New York: Library of America, 2007), 929, 932-33, 943.
- 11 “Nantaquoud” is the name of one of Powhatan’s sons. Smith, *True Relation*, 59; idem, *The Generall Historie of Virginia, New-England, and the Summer Isles* (1624), in *Complete Works*, 2: 151; Gleach, *Powhatan’s World and Colonial Virginia*, 109-22. The visualized disposition of the meals, the grains, and the sticks is available at J. Frederick Fausz, “Patterns of Anglo-Indian Aggression and Accommodation along the Mid-Atlantic Coast, 1584-1634,” in *Cultures in Contact: The Impact of European Contacts in Native American Cultural Institutions A.D. 1000-1800*, ed. William W. Fitzhugh (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1985), 240; J. A. Leo Lemay, *The American Dream of Captain John Smith* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1991), 70.
- 12 Smith, *True Relation*, 67; idem, *Generall Historie*, 152, 154, 156, 259; William Symonds, ed., *The Proceedings of the English Colonie in Virginia* (1612), in *Complete Works*, 1: 217; Francis Perkins to “a Friend in England,” 28 Mar. 1608, in *The Jamestown Voyages under the First Charter, 1606-1609*, ed. Philip L. Barbour (Nendeln, Kraus Reprint, 1976), 160.
- 13 Smith, *True Relation*, 81-95; idem, *Generall Historie*, 159-60, 162-80, 184; Symonds, *Proceedings*, 220-21, 224-33, 238; Martin H. Quitt, “Trade and Acculturation at Jamestown, 1607-1609: The Limits of Understanding,” *William and Mary Quarterly* 52.2 (1995):

- 246-47; Rountree, *Pocahontas, Powhatan, Opechancanough*, 102. On the exploration around the Chesapeake Bay, Helen C. Rountree, Wayne E. Clark, and Kent Mountford, *John Smith's Chesapeake Voyage, 1607-1609* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2007).
- 14 Symonds, *Proceedings*, 235-37; Smith, *Generall Historie*, 182-84.
- 15 Symonds, *Proceedings*, 239-50, 274; Smith, *Generall Historie*, 186-87, 191-99. Camilla Townsend doubted the veracity of Pocahontas's second rescue of Smith, but the description in *Generall Historie* in 1624 is corroborated by the comment in *Proceedings* in 1612 that "when her father intended to have surprized him, shee by stealth in the darke night came through the wild woods and told him of it." This was written by Richard Pots and "W. P. [William Phettiplace]," although Smith contributed to the book as an anonymous editor. Camilla Townsend, *Pocahontas and Powhatan Dilemma* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2004), 80.
- 16 Smith, *Generall Historie*, 203-4, 232. Smith also briefly introduced another rescue of the English by Pocahontas, which happened after Smith's departure for England, saying that "Pokahontas the Kings daughter saved a boy called Henry Spilman, that lived many yeeres after, by her meanes, amongst the Patawomekes."
- 17 Thomas Dale to "the R. and my most esteemed friend Mr. D. M.," 18 Jun. 1614, and Alexander Whitaker to "Cosen M. G.," 18 Jun. 1614, in Ralph Hamor, *A True Discourse of the Present Estate of Virginia* (1615), in *Writings with Other Narratives*, 1159, 1162. Rountree applied the concept of Stockholm syndrome to understand Pocahontas's acceptance of the English culture. This concept is based on the idea that captives tend to build a psychological alliance with their captors in terrifying situations. Rountree's view is not necessarily persuasive because Pocahontas had already held some sympathy toward the English before her captivity. Kupperman, *Pocahontas and the English Boys*, 188-89; Rountree, *Pocahontas, Powhatan, Opechancanough*, 162.
- 18 Smith, *Generall Historie*, 261.
- 19 *ibid.*, 41-42, 261; *idem*, *Advertisements for the Unexperienced Planters of New England, or Any Where* (1631), in *Complete Works*, 3: 288.
- 20 John Smith, *New Englands Trials* (1622), in *Complete Works*, 1: 432; *idem*, *Generall Historie*, 151, 258-59; Samuel Purchas, *Hakluytus Posthumus, or, Purchas His Pilgrimes* (1625; 20 vols.; Glasgow: James MacLehose and Sons, 1906), 18: 471-72.
- 21 Healey, foreword to *True Relation*, 24; Barbour, editorial note to *True Relation*, 108.
- 22 J. A. Leo Lemay, *Did Pocahontas Save Captain John Smith?* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1992); 26-27.
- 23 Smith, *Generall Historie*, 150; Lemay, *Did Pocahontas Save*, 58-63, 72-96.
- 24 Smith, *Generall Historie*, 261; Gleach, *Powhatan's World and Colonial Virginia*, 109-22.
- 25 Smith, *True Relation*, 93; *idem*, *Generall Historie*, 258-59; Symonds, *Proceedings*, 274; William Strachey, *Historie of Travaile into Virginia Britannia*, ed. R. H. Major (London: Printed for the Hakluyt Society, 1849), 65; "Life Portrait of Pocahontas," Virginia Historical Society, www.virginiahistory.org/collections-and-resources/virginia-history-explorer/life-portrait-pocahontas (accessed 22 Mar. 2019).
- 26 William Wirt Henry, "The Rescue of Captain John Smith by Pocahontas," *Potter's American Monthly* 4 (1875): 593; Townsend, *Pocahontas and Powhatan Dilemma*, 59. Townsend only said that the claim "[t]hat John Smith got to know Pocahontas at least a little during his days in Werowocomoco [i.e. during his captivity] seems beyond doubt." He continued to state that "[w]hether Pocahontas had some minor role in any particular adoption ceremony is an open question."
- 27 Barbour said that Smith had learned the Algonquian language from Thomas Hariot. Philip L. Barbour, *The Three Worlds of Captain John Smith* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1964), 98-99.
- 28 John Smith, *A Map of Virginia* (1612), in *Complete Works*, 1: 139; *idem*, *Generall Historie*, 152, 154, 259; Symonds, *Proceedings*, 274; Strachey, *Historie of Travaile*, 54, 65.
- 29 Smith, *True Relation*, 93-95; *idem*, *Generall Historie*, 160; Symonds, *Proceedings*, 220-21.
- 30 Smith, *True Relation*, 97; Symonds, *Proceedings*, 274; Strachey, *Historie of Travaile*, 54, 65; Hamor, *True Discourse*, 1121.
- 31 Smith, *Generall Historie*, 258-59.